UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,084	07/13/2005	Weihong Zheng	104300-2	9772
	590 04/17/2007 AUGHLIN & MARCU	EXAMINER		
875 THIRD AV		ALI, FARHAD		
18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2109	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/542,084	ZHENG ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
*	Farhad Ali	2109			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.  3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>2 and 3</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2005 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to b drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4)  Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal Pa	te			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/542,084 Page 2

Art Unit: 2109

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadesky et al. (US 7,046,230 B2) in view of Lin (US 2006/0075151 A1), and further in view of Wright et al. (US 7,103,381 B1).
- 3. With regard to claim 1 Zadesky et al. discloses a media player comprising of a microprocessor, ROM memory, and an amplifier (Column 5 Line 32-36). Zadesky also discloses a USB interface (Column 8 Line 42-44), a headphone jack for audio output (Column 8 Line 31-34), and a LCD display (Column 5 Line 50).

Zadesky does not disclose flash memory or a switch integrated circuit for collinear transmission of USB/Audio output.

Lin et al. discloses an audio player that can utilize flash memory (Paragraph 27) as a primary storage device.

Wright et al. discloses a switching circuit where a USB signal and audio signal are implemented over a shared conductor (Column 3 Line 31-39).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the media player disclosed by Zadesky to utilize flash memory and a switch integrated circuit for collinear transmission of USB/Audio output. It is prima facie Application/Control Number: 10/542,084 Page 3

Art Unit: 2109

obvious to combine the inventions, as flash memory is a commonly known alternative for storing data, and a switch integrated circuit for collinear transmission of USB/audio output would provide a added convenience to the consumer of having a single interface to interact with, as well as improving the overall visual appeal of the media player itself by reducing visible connectors.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claim 2 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. Claim 3 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

  F.A. 4/u/2007

Allm hu